

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
www.uspto.gov

			· ·		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/960,399	09/24/2001	Hiroshi Hashimoto	011225	5652	
	7590 07/02/2002		ţ.		
ARMSTRON	ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW.			EXAMINER	
SUITE 1000			WEISS, HOWARD		
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2814		
			DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003	•	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/960,399	HASHIMOTO ET AL.
omec Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
- The MAILING DATE of this	Howard Weiss	2814
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period with Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing carned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the slatutory minimum of Ihirty (30) o rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr	limely filed
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Ju	une 2002 .	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	s action is non-final.	
Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under EDisposition of Claims	nce except for formal matters, Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	prosecution as to the merits is 453 O.G. 213.
4) Claim(s) 1-18 s(are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 is are withdrawn		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	nom consideration.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>16-18</u> ls/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> are subject to restriction and/or ele	oction require	
Application Papers	ection requirement.	
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 September 2001</u> is/are	: a) accented or h) Appleated	to butho Evenin
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	Irawing(s) he held in abovenes	27.0ED 4.0E/ :
is	s: a) 🔲 approved b) 🦳 disappro	Oved by the Evaminar
in approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	to this Office action	Trod by the Examiner.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
riority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign pr	rionty under 35 U.S.C. & 119/a)-(d) or (f)
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		/ (w) or (i).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ave been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ave been received in Application	an No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority	documents have been receive	d in this National State
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t	he certified copies not received	1
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic pr	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisi 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic pr	onal application has be	
actimient(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (5) Notice of Informal Pa	PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	6)	

Art Unit: 2814 -

Attorney's Docket Number: 011225

Filing Date: 9/24/01

Continuing Data: none

Claimed Foreign Priority Date: 6/21/01 (JPX)

Applicant(s): Hashimoto et al. (Takahashi)

Examiner: Howard Weiss

Election/Restrictions

1. The Applicants' election without traverse of Group II, Claims 16 to 18, in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 1 to 15 are withdrawn from consideration as being for a non-elected invention. The Applicants are requested to cancel the non-elected claims as part of a complete response to this office action. Cancellation of the non-elected claims would not preclude the later filing of a divisional application on the non-elected invention (please see 35 USC 120 and121).

Drawings

3. Figures 1 to 30 (inclusive) should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In Line 27 on Page 1, "careers" should be changed to ---carriers---. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 09/960,399

Art Unit: 2814

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by admitted Prior Art Figures 8.

Admitted Prior Art Figures 8 shows all aspects of the instant invention including a substrate 11 with a non-volatile memory A and first to third MOS transistors B, C, D with gates insulation films 12B, 12C, 12D of increasing thicknesses and gates electrodes 16B, 16C, 16D of substantially identical height.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order

Application/Control Number: 09/960,399

Art Unit: 2814

for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Initially, and with respect to Claims 17 and 18, note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See *In re Thorpe et al., 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985)* and the related case law cited therein which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. As stated in Thorpe,

even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. In re Brown, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972); In re Pilkington, 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147 (CCPA 1969); Buono v. Yankee Maid Dress Corp., 77 F.2d 274, 279, 26 USPQ 57, 61 (2d. Cir. 1935).

Note that Applicant has burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear.

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over admitted Prior Art Figures 8.

Admitted Prior Art Figures 8 show all aspects of the instant invention (Paragraph 7) further including a floating gate **13** with a control gate **16** formed on said floating gate via an insulation film **14**.

As to the grounds of rejection under section 103(a), how the gate electrodes are form (either from the same silicon films or from different films) relates to intermediate process steps and does not affect the final device structure. See MPEP § 2113 which discusses the handling of "product by process" claims and recommends the alternative (§ 102 / § 103) grounds of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 09/960,399

Art Unit: 2814

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted Prior Art Figures 8 and Gwen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,892).

Admitted Prior Art Figures 8 show most aspects of the instant invention (paragraph 7) except for the control gate and the MOS gates constructed of two silicon films. Gwen et al. teaches (e.g. Figure 3I) to form control gate and MOS gates of two silicon films 206, 208 to decrease the number of processing steps (Column 4 Lines 45 to 50). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form control gate and MOS gates of two silicon films as taught by Gwen et al. in the Device of the Admitted Prior Art Figures 8 to decrease the number of processing steps.

Conclusion

- 12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Muramoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,140) teach to have MOS gate films of varying thicknesses and Yaegashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,265,739) teach a similar device as the instant invention.
- 13. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2814 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2814 via the Art Unit 2814 Fax Center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 3C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 or -7724. The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2814 applications. The official TC2800 Before-Final, (703) 872-9318, and After-Final, (703) 872-9319, Fax numbers will provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt of their fax by the USPTO.
- 14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Howard Weiss at (703) 308-4840 and between the

Art Unit: 2814

hours of 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday or by e-mail via **Howard.Weiss@uspto.gov**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2800 Receptionist at **(703) 308-0956**.

15. The following list is the Examiner's field of search for the present Office Action:

Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class / Subclass(es): 257/321,392	6/28/02
Other Documentation: PLUS Analysis Report	6/24/02
Electronic Database(s): EAST	6/28/02

HW/hw 28 June 2002 Howard Weiss Patent Examiner Art Unit 2814